

**PROPOSED ADOPTION OF A " DECLARATION " REGARDING THE  
METHOD TO BE FOLLOWED IN DETERMINING THE RELATIVE  
PRECEDENCE TO BE ACCORDED TO TWO OR MORE NAMES  
FOR FAMILY-GROUP TAXA PUBLISHED IN THE SAME BOOK  
AND ON THE SAME DATE**

By **FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.**

*(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)*

**(Commission Reference : Z.N.(S.) 1141)**

The purpose of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to adopt a *Declaration* regarding the method to be followed in determining the relative precedence to be accorded to two or more names for family-group taxa published in the same book and on the same date.

2. The foregoing problem has arisen in connection with the precedence to be accorded to the names for two tribes, EVERIDI and CUPIDINIDI (correction of CUPIDIDI) in the family LYCAENIDAE (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) on which an application (Z.N.(S.) 1138) is being submitted to the Commission for the purpose of securing the continued use of the name *Cupido* Schrank, 1801, in its accustomed sense<sup>1</sup>. Both the foregoing family-group names were published in [1907] in the same Part of Volume 2 of Tutt's *Natural History of the British Butterflies* (: 327). The name EVERIDI Tutt is in general use for the taxon having *Everes* Hübner, [1819], as type genus and by some authors (e.g. Lorković) this family-group taxon has been elevated to subfamily rank. The genus *Cupido* Schrank, 1801, is regarded by some authors as typifying a distinct family-group taxon, but by others as being properly placed in the same family-group taxon as *Everes* Hübner. The question now to be considered is what is the family-group name which should be used by those specialists who consider that the genera *Everes* Hübner and *Cupido* Schrank should be separated from other genera at the family-group level but should themselves be placed in the same family-group taxon. Should the name EVERIDI (or EVERINAE) be used for this taxon or should the name CUPIDINIDI (or CUPIDININAE) be used for this taxon ?

3. The *Règles*, as adopted by the Fifth International Congress of Zoology, Berlin, 1901, provided in Article 28 that the relative precedence to be accorded to generic names and specific names published in the same book and on the same date was to be determined in accordance with the "First Reviser

---

<sup>1</sup> For the application here referred to see pp. 267-274 of the present Part.  
*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* Vol. 12, Part 10. October 1956.

Principle". In 1948 the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, substituted the "Page and Line Precedence Principle" as that which should be applied in such cases (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 330-331), but this change did not secure general approval and in 1953 the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology reversed the decision of the Paris Congress in this matter and re-instated the "First Reviser Principle" (1953, *Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl.* : 66-67, Decision 123). At the same time the Copenhagen Congress inserted in the *Règles* a provision defining the expression "First Reviser" (*ibid.* : 67, Decision 124), thus largely meeting the point of view of those taxonomists who had till then disliked the "First Reviser Principle" because of the practical difficulties involved in its application through the lack of guidance as to what action an author is required to take in order to qualify himself for recognition as a "First Reviser".

4. The possibility that the problem discussed above might arise not only in connection with generic and specific names but also in connection with names published for family-group taxa was overlooked when at Copenhagen in 1953 the provisions in the *Règles* relating to family-group names were revised by the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology. There is therefore at present no provision in the *Règles* for determining the relative precedence to be accorded to names for family-group taxa published in the same book or paper and on the same date. It is desirable that this omission should now be rectified as quickly as possible, for it is likely that the foregoing problem will be found to arise fairly frequently in view of the fact that, although in many cases family-group names were introduced into the literature singly, there are numerous works containing sections devoted entirely to questions of supra-generic classification in which considerable numbers of new nominal family-group taxa were introduced in close proximity to one another and where in consequence the problem discussed above has already arisen.

5. In view of the decision by the Copenhagen Congress that the best way of dealing with this problem when it arises in connection with the names of genera and species is to apply the "First Reviser Principle", it would be both illogical and undesirable to apply any other principle for dealing with this problem at the family-group-name level. I therefore recommend that this principle be adopted, its application being made subject to conditions similar to those prescribed by the Copenhagen Congress in relation to the determination of the relative precedence to be accorded to generic or specific names when published in the same book or paper and on the same date.

6. I accordingly submit for the consideration of the International Commission the proposal that it adopt a *Declaration* in the following terms :—

**DRAFT DECLARATION :** (1) The relative precedence to be accorded to any two names for nominal family-group taxa published in the same work and on the same date shall be determined in accordance with the "First Reviser

Principle", that is, when two such taxa are united on taxonomic grounds, the name to be used for the combined taxon so recognised is to be whichever of the previously published family-group names is selected for use as such by a "First Reviser" ("selection by a First Reviser").

(2) For the purposes of (1) above the expression "selection by a First Reviser" is to be rigidly construed and such a selection is to be deemed to have been effected only when an author, after citing two or more family-group names published in the same work and on the same date, clearly indicates, by whatever method, (a) that he is of the opinion that the respective type genera of the nominal family-group taxa concerned are referable to a single family-group taxon, and (b) that he is selecting one of the family-group names concerned, to the exclusion of the other name or names, to be the name for the combined family-group taxon so recognised.

**SUPPORT FOR DR. HOLTHUIS' PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE  
GENERIC NAME "PANULIRUS" WHITE, 1847 (CLASS CRUSTACEA,  
ORDER DECAPODA)**

By **TEISO ESAKI**

(*Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan*)

(Commission Reference : Z.N.(S.) 1030)

(For the proposal in this case see *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 12 : 55—59)

(Letter received 21st August 1956)

I would like to support Dr. Holthuis' application for preserving *Panulirus* White, 1847, by suppressing its senior subjective synonym *Phyllosoma* Leach, 1818. The species of *Panulirus* are important as marine products in Japan, and its type species, *Panulirus japonicus* (von Siebold, 1824), is well known and one of the most appreciated delicacies in this country. For those species the generic name *Panulirus* has been most extensively used in both scientific and economic papers for many years. The name *Phyllosoma* is also popular in textbooks of zoology and fisheries as denoting a special stage of development, but is never used as a generic name. Therefore the preservation of the name *Panulirus* as the generic name of the Japanese Spiny Lobster and allied species is highly desirable in the interest of stability.